

REMARKS**I. General**

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 8, 13, and 14 are indicated by this Office Action as containing allowable subject matter. The issues in the Office Action mailed November 3, 2004 are as follows:

Claims 1-7, 9-12, and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 1-16 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting. Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph. Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 14 are amended.

II. Amendments to the Claims

The following amendments to the claims have been made:

- Claim 1 is amended to recite, in part, “obtaining authorization information acceptable by said particular provider in conducting said transaction; and printing said authorization information,” and also “wherein said general multi-purpose processor-based system executes a computer program in addition to a computer program operable for authorizing said transaction to be conducted.”
- Claim 9 is amended to recite, in part, “wherein said general multi-purpose processor-based system executes a general-purpose computer program.”
Claim 12 has been amended to make its language consistent with that of claim 9.
- Claim 8 is amended to recite, in part, “obtaining authorization information acceptable by said particular provider in conducting said transaction; and printing said authorization information.”
- Claim 13 is amended to recite, in part, “obtaining authorization information acceptable by said particular provider in conducting said transaction; and printing said authorization information.”

Applicant believes that the above-listed amendments merely make explicit what was previously implicit in the claims. Accordingly, no new matter is added, nor are the amendments narrowing.

III. Applicant's Record Under M.P.E.P. § 713.04 of Interview with the Examiner

Applicants' attorneys appreciate the Examiner's time and consideration in conducting the telephone interview of January 18, 2005. Applicant respectfully submits the following record of the telephone interview of January 18, 2005 under M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

The following persons participated in the interviews: Examiner Edward R. Cosimano and Applicants' Attorneys Ross Viguet (reg. #42,203) and Thomas Kelton (reg. #54,214).

With regard to items 5.1, 5.2 A and B, 7.1, and 7.2 A and B, the Examiner agreed that amendments to the rejected claims that recite obtaining the printed authorization information or other similar amendments will overcome those rejections. The Examiner agreed to drop the rejections under items 5.2 C and 7.2 C without amendment.

The Examiner agreed to drop duplicative Thiel references.

The Examiner also agreed that rejections over the art of record would be overcome if amendments to claims 1 and 9 were made that explicitly recite that the general-purpose processor-based systems run at least one program that is not limited to postage.

In view of the telephone interview of January 18, 2005, Applicant hereby presents amended claims for the Examiner's consideration.

IV. Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-47 of United States patent number 6,233,568. As with the last response to Office Action, Applicant again proposes filing a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(b) if the Examiner's rejections still stand upon indication that the claims of the present application are otherwise allowable. Applicant notes that amendments to the claims of the present application may result in the withdrawal of this rejection. Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this rejection in view of the amendments made to the claims of the present application and the arguments presented herein.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Item 5 on page 3 of the Office Action states that claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Applicant hereby presents amendments to claims 1, 8, and 13, which Applicant believes are sufficiently clear and comply with the Examiner's request in the above-mentioned telephone interview. Further, it is believed that claims 9-12 and 14 already comply with the Examiner's suggestion because claims 9 and 14 recite, in part, "means for generating authorization information acceptable by said particular provider in conducting said transaction." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections in items 5.1-5.3 be withdrawn and claims 1-16 passed to issue.

VI. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-12, and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either United States patent number 4,495,581 (hereinafter, *Piccione*), or United States patent number 5,117,346 (hereinafter, *Barns-Slavin*), or European patent publication number 0805422 (hereinafter, *Thiel EP*), or United States patent number 5,699,258 (hereinafter, *Thiel US1*), or United States patent number 6,035,291 (hereinafter, *Thiel US2*), or United States patent number 6,321,214 (hereinafter *Thiel US3*), in view of United States patent number 6,039,257 (hereinafter, *Berson*).

Further, claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either *Piccione*, or *Barns-Slavin*, or *Thiel EP*, or *Thiel US1*, or *Thiel US2*, or *Thiel US3*, in view of *Berson* in further view of either U.S. patent no. 4,914,606 (hereinafter, *Vermesse*) or U.S. patent no. 5,233,532 (hereinafter, *Ramsden*).

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 9 in order to comply with the Examiner's request in the above-mentioned telephone interview. Applicant believes that rejected claims 1-7, 9-12, and 15-16 are allowable over the cited art and should, accordingly, be passed to issue.

VII. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the telephone interview referenced above, the Examiner agreed to drop the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections under item 7.2C and to withdraw the rejections under items 7.1 through 7.2 B if amendments were made to claims 1, 8, and 13. Applicant hereby presents amendments to those claims, asserts that claims 1-16 are directed to statutory subject matter, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections of claims 1-16.

VIII. Conclusion

In view of the above arguments and amendments, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-2380, under Order No. 61135/P000C2CP1C1/10106029 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
R. Ross Viguet
Registration No.: 42,203
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201-2784
(214) 855-8185
(214) 855-8200 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant